

# **TEEN PARENT PROGRAM**

## **OUTCOME REPORT (October 2001 – October 2002)**

**Data Prepared by  
Office of Performance Excellence  
Michigan Family Independence Agency**

**March 2004**

## TEEN PARENT PROGRAM (TPP) OCT01-OCT02<sup>1</sup>

The Michigan Family Independence Agency's monitoring of its Teen Parent Program (TPP) began October 1, 1994. The TPP operates in the following eighteen counties: Berrien, Calhoun, Chippewa, Clare, Genesee, Ingham, Jackson, Kalamazoo, Kent, Lake, Montcalm, Muskegon, Newaygo, Oakland, Ogemaw, Saginaw, Van Buren, and Wayne<sup>2</sup>.

### ***Executive Summary***

This document presents information related to the Teen Parent Program for the following three reporting periods: October 2001, April 2002, and October 2002. In terms of the contractual criteria, the program **averaged** the following results over the three reporting periods.

- **CRITERION #1:** Eighty-five percent (85%) of the teen parents who have not completed high school will attend school, full-time, or GED classes within four months of entry to the Teen Parent Program.

Over the three reporting periods, the program averaged 71.1%, with an additional average of 5.8% becoming involved in educational activities beyond the fourth month.

- **CRITERION #2:** Seventy-five percent (75%) of the teen parents will be involved in education or training programs, or will be employed, within four (4) months of program entry.

The program averaged 73.9%, with an additional average of 6.4% becoming involved in such activities beyond the fourth month.

- **CRITERION #3:** Eighty-five percent (85%) of the participating teen parents who are not pregnant at the time of program entry will not become pregnant within twelve (12) months of program entry.

An average of 89.9% of the teen parents who were not pregnant at the time of program entry did not become pregnant within twelve months of program entry.

---

<sup>1</sup> Data Source: Teen Parent Program Semi-Annual Monitoring Reports for October 2001, April 2002, and October 2002.

<sup>2</sup> There are four TPP providers operating in Wayne County.

- **CRITERION #4:** Ninety percent (90%) of the teen mothers who are pregnant at the time of program entry will participate in prenatal care.

An average of 99.5% of the teen mothers who were pregnant at the time of program entry participated in prenatal care.

- **CRITERION #5:** Seventy-five percent (75%) of the teen parents who are pregnant at the time of program entry will deliver full-term infants.

An average of 93.0% of the teen parents who were pregnant at the time of program entry delivered full-term infants.

- **CRITERION #6:** Ninety percent (90%) of the teen parent's children/infants<sup>3</sup> will be referred and/or receive thorough medical examinations, well-baby examinations, and immunizations within two (2) months of entry into the Teen Parent Program.

An average of 57.3% of the teens' children/infants were either referred for or started receiving immunizations within two months of program entry, with an additional average of 30.0% having been referred for or started receiving said service beyond the second month. Overall, regardless of time frame, an average of 87.3% of the teens' children/infants were referred for or started receiving immunizations.

An average of 54.5% of the teens' children/infants were either referred for or started receiving well-baby/EPSTD examinations within two months of program entry, with an additional average of 29.1% having been referred for or started receiving said service beyond the second month. Overall, regardless of time frame, an average of 83.6% of the teens' children/infants were referred for or started receiving well-baby/EPSTD examinations.

- **CRITERION #7:** Eighty percent (80%) of the teen parents participating in the Teen Parent Program and eligible for Infant Support Services (ISS) will also participate in ISS.

An average of 54.9% of the teens eligible for ISS participated therein. Meanwhile, an average of 13.8% failed to participate in ISS due to factors beyond their control, and an average of 4.6% refused to participate in ISS.

---

<sup>3</sup> CRITERION #6: Data collection regarding immunizations and Well-Baby/EPSTD participation focused on the youngest child in the family.

- **CRITERION #8:** Eighty-five percent (85%) of the teen parents and/or their children ages 0-3 years will be referred and/or receive child development and parenting education within three months of program entry.

An average of 80.6% of the teen parents and/or their children were either referred for or started receiving child development education within three months of program entry, with an additional average of 8.0% having been referred for or started receipt of said service beyond the third month. Overall, regardless of time frame, an average of 88.6% of the teens and/or their children were referred for or started receiving child development education.

An average of 87.6% of the teen parents and/or their children were either referred for or started receiving parenting education within three months of program entry, with an additional average of 6.5% having been referred for or started receipt of said service beyond the third month. Overall, regardless of time frame, an average of 94.0% of the teens and/or their children were referred for or started receiving parenting education.

- **CRITERION #9:** Ninety percent (90%) of the teen parents will not have a “preponderance of evidence” child abuse or neglect finding for one (1) year from date of entry into the program.

Overall<sup>4</sup>, 95.8% of the teen parents did not have a “preponderance of evidence” child abuse or neglect finding for one year from date of entry into the program.

---

<sup>4</sup> CRITERION #9: Data related to this criterion were examined in the aggregate (i.e., the three cohorts/reporting periods were not examined individually).

This document presents information related to the Teen Parent Program for the following three reporting periods: October 2001, April 2002, and October 2002.

- **Section I** of this document presents information related to the desired outcomes of the program as presented in the contract.
- **Section II** provides further detail regarding the educational pursuits of the participants.
- **Section III** focuses on other support services provided, either directly or indirectly, by the teen parent provider agencies.
- **Section IV** examines the reasons behind case closures.

**SECTION I:**  
**CONTRACTUAL CRITERIA**

General findings with respect to each of nine contractual criteria are presented below for each of the aforementioned three reporting cohorts<sup>5</sup>. These nine criteria address such items as self-sufficiency, pregnancy-related concerns, and health issues.

### **A. SELF-SUFFICIENCY**

**CRITERION #1: Eighty-five percent (85%) of the teen parents who have not completed high school will attend school, full-time, or GED classes within four months of entry to the Teen Parent Program.**

Report Month / Year	Number who have not completed high school	Involvement in Educational Activity <b>AT INTAKE or WITHIN</b> Four Months		Involvement in Educational Activity <b>BEYOND</b> Four Months	
		N	%	N	%
Oct01	1,173	831	<b>70.8</b>	81	6.9
Apr02	1,380	984	<b>71.3</b>	70	5.1
Oct02	1,445	1,029	<b>71.2</b>	79	5.5

- This criterion serves as a simple “point in time” measure of the number of teens enrolled in elementary or secondary school (or GED training) within four months of entering the program. It does not address the issue of consistency in enrollment. Indeed, many of the teens experience numerous stops and starts when it comes to school or GED training. The issue of continuity in enrollment is addressed further in Section II of this document.

**CRITERION #2: Seventy-five percent (75%) of the teen parents will be involved in education or training programs, or will be employed, within four (4) months of program entry.**

Report Month / Year <sup>6</sup>	Number of TPP Participants	Involvement in Educational/Training/Employment Activity <b>AT INTAKE or WITHIN</b> Four Months		Involvement in Educational/Training/Employment Activity <b>BEYOND</b> Four Months	
		N	%	N	%
Oct01	1,349	986	<b>73.1</b>	90	6.7
Apr02	1,624	1,204	<b>74.1</b>	94	5.8
Oct02	1,708	1,274	<b>74.6</b>	117	6.9

- The first occurring activity (either at or following program intake) was used for the analysis of this criterion.

<sup>5</sup> Note: Analysis for Criterion #9 was taken in the aggregate (i.e., the three cohorts/reporting periods were not examined individually).

<sup>6</sup> CRITERION #2: The OCT01 cohort had twelve additional individuals involved in an activity, however, the time frame was indeterminate. Similarly, the APR02 cohort had nine such individuals, and the OCT02 cohort had five.

- When a participant was involved in more than one activity simultaneously, the following order of priority was established: educational activity (i.e., completion of high school and/or GED attainment and/or college), followed by employment and training.

## **B. PREGNANCY-RELATED CONCERNS**

**CRITERION #3: Eighty-five percent (85%) of the participating teen parents who are not pregnant at the time of program entry will not become pregnant within twelve (12) months of program entry.**

Report Month/Year	Number <b>NOT</b> pregnant at program entry	Did <b>NOT</b> experience repeat pregnancy within 12 months of program entry	
		N	%
Oct01	672	613	<b>91.2</b>
Apr02	780	692	<b>88.7</b>
Oct02	796	718	<b>90.2</b>

- Removing the twelve month time frame from the analysis reveals the following repeat pregnancy percentages for those who were **NOT** pregnant at intake: Oct01 – 11.2%; Apr02 – 14.0%; and Oct02 – 12.2%.
- Meanwhile, further analysis of those who **were pregnant** at intake reveals the following repeat pregnancy percentages, regardless of twelve month time frame: Oct01 – 10.0%; Apr02 – 8.3%; and Oct02 – 8.3%.
- The overall repeat pregnancy percentages (regardless of pregnancy status at intake and regardless of twelve month time frame) were as follows: Oct01 – 10.5%; Apr02 – 11.0%; and Oct02 – 10.0%.
  - Note: An average of 10.9% of these teens were married.
- It should be noted that, in terms of statewide data<sup>7</sup>, 26.6% of live births occurring in 2001, to mothers age 15-20, were subsequent births. In 2002, that figure was 25.6%.

<sup>7</sup> Source: Department of Community Health, Vital Records and Health Data Development Section.



**CRITERION #4:** Ninety percent (90%) of the teen mothers who are pregnant at the time of program entry will participate in prenatal care.

Report Month/Year	Number pregnant at program entry	Participation in Prenatal Care <sup>8</sup>	
		N	%
Oct01	673	655	<b>99.1</b>
Apr02	843	826	<b>99.9</b>
Oct02	894	878	<b>99.4</b>

**CRITERION #5:** Seventy-five percent (75%) of the teen parents who are pregnant at the time of program entry will deliver full-term infants.

Report Month/Year	Number pregnant at program entry and giving birth by report Month/Yr	Delivery of Full-Term Infants	
		N	%
Oct01	497	464	<b>93.4</b>
Apr02	625	625	<b>92.5</b>
Oct02	665	665	<b>93.2</b>

### **C. HEALTH ISSUES**

**CRITERION #6:** Ninety percent (90%) of the teen parent's children/infants<sup>9</sup> will be referred and/or receive thorough medical examinations, well-baby examinations, and immunizations within two (2) months of entry into the Teen Parent Program<sup>10</sup>.

#### **1. Immunizations:**

Report Month/Year	Number Eligible for Immunizations	Referral and/or Receipt of Immunizations <b>AT INTAKE or WITHIN</b> Two Months of Program Entry		Referral and/or Receipt of Immunizations <b>BEYOND</b> Two Months of Program Entry	
		N	%	N	%
Oct01	1,097	638	<b>58.2</b>	329	30.0
Apr02	1,218	707	<b>58.0</b>	374	30.7
Oct02	1,224	380	<b>55.6</b>	360	29.4

<sup>8</sup> CRITERION #4: Each cohort had a number of cases missing prenatal information: OCT01 – twelve cases, APR02 – sixteen cases, and OCT02 – eleven cases.

<sup>9</sup> CRITERION #6: Data collection regarding immunizations and Well-Baby/EPSTD participation focused on the youngest child in the family.

<sup>10</sup> One “outlier” agency was removed from the analysis of both immunizations and well-baby care (i.e., the agency failed to identify start dates for referrals and/or receipt of services).

- Attaching a time frame to receipt of immunizations may not be the most efficient measure, as immunizations coincide with the birth of the baby, which may or may not coincide with a teen's entry into the program. As such, removing the two-month time frame from the analysis (i.e., including those who were referred for or became involved in the service beyond the two-month mark) reveals the following referral/participation percentages amongst those eligible for the service: Oct01 – 88.2%; Apr02 – 88.7%; and Oct02 – 85.0%.

## 2. Well-Baby/EPSDT:

Report Month/Year	Number Eligible for Well-Baby or EPSDT <sup>11</sup>	Referral and/or Receipt of Service <b>AT INTAKE or WITHIN</b> Two Months of Program Entry		Referral and/or Receipt of Service <b>BEYOND</b> Two Months of Program Entry	
		N	%	N	%
Oct01	1,030	579	<b>56.2</b>	281	27.3
Apr02	1,163	640	<b>55.0</b>	352	30.3
Oct02	1,169	611	<b>52.3</b>	349	29.9

- With respect to Well-Baby examinations, many of the teen parent providers have asserted that, while they are able to make referrals, they often have a difficult time accessing HMO's for information regarding actual appointments.
- Attaching a time frame to receipt of well-baby/medical examinations may not be the most efficient measure, as such visits coincide with the birth of the baby, which may or may not coincide with a teen's entry into the program. As such, removing the two-month time frame from the analysis (i.e., including those who were referred for or began medical examinations beyond the two-month mark) reveals the following referral/participation percentages amongst those eligible for the service: Oct01 – 83.5%; Apr02 – 85.3%; and Oct02 – 82.2%.

<sup>11</sup> CRITERION #6: A number of counties no longer have access to EPSDT services.

**CRITERION #7: Eighty percent (80%) of the teen parents participating in the Teen Parent Program and eligible for Infant Support Services (ISS) will also participate in ISS<sup>12</sup>.**

Report Month/Year	Number Eligible for ISS	Participating in ISS	
		N	%
Oct01	799	512	<b>64.1</b>
Apr02	930	495	<b>53.2</b>
Oct02	968	460	<b>47.5</b>

- Each of the three cohorts had a number of individuals who refused to participate in ISS: Oct01 – 109 (13.6%); Apr02 – 135 (14.5%); and Oct02 – 127 (13.1%).
- Each of the three cohorts had a number of individuals who failed to participate in ISS due to factors beyond their control: Oct01 – 29 (3.6%); Apr02 – 62 (6.7%); and Oct02 – 33 (3.4%).
- Examples of failing to participate due to factors beyond the client's control include the following:
  - difficulties with HMO's (e.g., Wellness Plan denied approval for continuation of ISS);
  - TPP case terminated before ISS worker was assigned;
  - no Medicaid, therefore, no ISS;
  - no insurance; and
  - participant works with public health nurse (rather than ISS).

<sup>12</sup> Note: The analysis excludes one county that did not have ISS services at the time of reporting. ISS services were scheduled to return to the county October 2002.

**CRITERION #8: Eighty-five percent (85%) of the teen parents and/or their children ages 0-3 years will be referred and/or receive child development and parenting education within three months of program entry<sup>13</sup>.**

1. Child Development Education:

Report Month/Year	Number Eligible for Child Development Education	Referral and/or Receipt of Service <b>AT INTAKE or WITHIN</b> Three Months of Program Entry		Referral and/or Receipt of Service <b>BEYOND</b> Three Months of Program Entry	
		N	%	N	%
Oct01	1,091	863	<b>79.1</b>	84	7.7
Apr02	1,271	1,027	<b>80.8</b>	117	9.2
Oct02	1,295	1,061	<b>81.9</b>	91	7.0

2. Parenting Education:

Report Month/Year	Number Eligible for Parenting Education	Referral and/or Receipt of Service <b>AT INTAKE or WITHIN</b> Three Months of Program Entry		Referral and/or Receipt of Service <b>BEYOND</b> Three Months of Program Entry	
		N	%	N	%
Oct01	1,172	994	<b>84.8</b>	82	7.0
Apr02	1,348	1,185	<b>87.9</b>	93	6.9
Oct02	1,356	1,220	<b>90.0</b>	74	5.5

<sup>13</sup> One "outlier" agency was removed from the analysis of both child development education and parenting education (i.e., the agency failed to identify start dates for referrals and/or receipt of services).

**CRITERION #9: Ninety percent (90%) of the teen parents will not have a “preponderance of evidence” child abuse or neglect finding for one (1) year from date of entry into the program.**

A data pull on the unduplicated count of teen parent participants (i.e., 2,521 participants across all three cohorts) resulted in the acquisition of 2,314 valid recipient Ids (RIDs) from the FIA data warehouse. In turn, these RIDs were used to acquire information related to Protective Services (PS). More specifically, 1,706 of these RIDs appeared in the Department’s Protective Services Management Information System (PSMIS).

PSMIS Database				
Number of TPP Participants	Not Found in PSMIS		Found in PSMIS	
	N	%	N	%
2,521	815	32.3	1,706	67.7

1. Protective Services Contact Within One Year of TPP Entry<sup>14</sup>

- Of the 2,521 participants, 2,347 or 93.1% did not have a “preponderance of evidence” (i.e., substantiated) child abuse/neglect finding within one year of entering the program.

Substantiated Protective Services Contact <b>WITHIN</b> One Year of TPP Entry				
Number of TPP Participants	No Protective Services Contact		Protective Services Contact	
	N	%	N	%
2,521	2,347	93.1	174	6.9

- 174 or 6.9% of the teen parents did have a “preponderance of evidence” finding within one year of entering the program.
- Further analysis of those 174 substantiated cases reveals that 43 (24.7%) were victims, 107 (61.5%) were perpetrators, and 42 (24.1%) were uninvolved in the substantiated case<sup>15</sup> (i.e., they were neither a perpetrator nor a victim in the substantiated case).
- The 107 perpetrators represent 4.2% of the population under study. Thus, in all actuality, **95.8% did not** experience a substantiated abuse/neglect finding, as a perpetrator, within one year of program entry.
- The 2,347 participants who did not have protective services contact within one year of entering the Teen Parent Program includes 815 who have never

<sup>14</sup> Note: There were eighteen additional individuals who had a “preponderance of evidence” finding within one year of TPP entry, however, their role in the event was undetermined.

<sup>15</sup> Note: the total does not equal 100.0% due to the occurrence of multiple incidents (e.g., a teen parent participant may have been involved in more than one incident, taking on more than one role). This holds true for subsequent discussions of “role” (i.e., discussions associated with the historical analysis and the analysis focusing on one year after TPP enrollment).

had contact with PS, and 1,532 who had contact that occurred outside of the one year time frame.

- Note: The 815 who have never had contact with Protective Services represent 32.3% of the population under study.

## 2. PS Contact Prior to TPP Entry<sup>16</sup>

Additional examination of the historical data revealed that a number of participants had a history of contact with Protective Services **prior** to entering the Teen Parent Program.

- Specifically, of the 2,521 participants used in the analysis, 942 (37.4%) did have a “preponderance of evidence” (i.e., substantiated) child abuse/neglect finding prior to program entry.

Substantiated Protective Services Contact <b>PRIOR</b> to TPP Entry				
Number of TPP Participants	No Protective Services Contact		Protective Services Contact	
	N	%	N	%
2,521	1,579	62.6	942	37.4

- Further analysis of those 942 substantiated cases reveals that 718 (76.2%) were victims, 104 (11.0%) were perpetrators, and 386 (41.0%) were uninvolved in the substantiated case.
- The 104 perpetrators represent 4.1% of the population under study.

## 3. Beyond the One-Year Mark<sup>17</sup>

Meanwhile, further examination of the data reveals that 8.0% (201) of the participants experienced a “preponderance of evidence” (i.e., substantiated) finding **beyond** the one-year mark in the program.

Substantiated Protective Services Contact <b>BEYOND</b> One Year of TPP Entry				
Number of TPP Participants	No Protective Services Contact		Protective Services Contact	
	N	%	N	%
2,521	2,320	92.0	201	8.0

- Further analysis of those 201 substantiated cases revealed that 26 (12.9%) were victims, 142 (70.6%) were perpetrators, and 56 (27.9%) were uninvolved in the substantiated case.

<sup>16</sup> Note: There were nine additional individuals who had a “preponderance of evidence” finding prior to TPP entry, however, their role in the event was undetermined.

<sup>17</sup> Note: There were twenty-seven additional individuals who had a “preponderance of evidence” finding beyond one year of TPP entry, however, their role in the event was undetermined.

- The 142 perpetrators represent 5.6% of the population under study.

#### 4. Referrals Only

In terms of PS referrals that did not result in “preponderance of evidence” findings or substantiation, 1,582 individuals or 62.7% of the population under study did experience referrals to protective services at one time or another. Again, these referrals were never substantiated.

Referrals Only – No Preponderance of Evidence Finding/Substantiation								
Number of TPP Participants	Individuals Experiencing Referrals (Overall)		Individuals Experiencing Referrals (Before TPP Entry)		Individuals Experiencing Referrals (Within One Year of Entry)		Individuals Experiencing Referrals (Beyond One Year of Entry)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2,521	1,581	62.7	1,383	54.9	448	17.8	579	23.0

**SECTION II:**  
**EDUCATIONAL PURSUITS IN FURTHER DETAIL**



Closer examination of the program participants based on their educational status at intake is presented below. This discussion attempts to provide an indication of the level of continuity that exists with respect to the educational pursuits of the teens.

#### **A. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE: DROP OUT**

Report Mo/Yr	Number of TPP Participants	Number Missing Educational Status	Educational Status at Intake: Drop Out		Enrolled in School at Report Date		Not Enrolled in School at Report Date	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct01	1,349	35	455	34.6	128	29.4	308	70.6
Apr02	1,624	14	544	33.8	117	21.6	425	78.4
Oct02	1,708	24	559	33.2	125	22.6	427	77.4

- Approximately one-third of the participants in each of the three cohorts (an average of 33.9%) reportedly were not engaged in an educational activity at the time they entered the teen parent program.
- By each of the three reporting periods, approximately one quarter of that “drop out” group (an average of 24.5%) was reportedly enrolled in school.

Report Mo/Yr	Educational Status at Intake: Drop Out	Enrolled in School at Report Date <sup>18</sup>	Enrollment was Continuous		Not Enrolled in School at Report Date <sup>19</sup>	Not Enrolled because earned diploma or GED		Not Enrolled because of barriers beyond the client's control	
			N	%		N	%	N	%
Oct01	455	128	91	72.8	308	17	5.5	39	12.7
Apr02	544	117	81	69.2	425	24	5.6	57	13.4
Oct02	559	125	94	77.0	427	14	3.3	65	15.3

- Furthermore, for almost three-quarters of those “re-enrolled” teens (i.e., an average of 73.0%), their enrollment was continuous (i.e., no excessive breaks/absences).
- Approximately five percent (i.e., an average of 4.8%) of those not enrolled at intake, had enrolled in school or GED training and had earned their high school diploma or GED by the report date.
- Of those not enrolled at intake or at the report date(s), an average of 13.8% cited barriers to enrollment which were beyond their control. In general

<sup>18</sup> Both the OCT01 and the OCT02 cohorts were each missing information about continuity of enrollment for three cases.

<sup>19</sup> The OCT02 cohort had one case that was missing a reason for not being enrolled.

terms, these reported barriers, presented here and in subsequent tables throughout the discussion in Section II, concern such things as transportation, child care, lack of familial support, housing issues, and medical issues. More specifically, some of the identified barriers were as follows:

- lack of transportation;
- lack of child care;
- unstable housing/homelessness;
- high risk pregnancy (home bound; doctor ordered bed rest);
- domestic violence issues (e.g., conflicts at home/family problems);
- health problems (of teen, teen's child and/or other family members);
- death in family (i.e., parent, child, etc.);
- required/needs to work (e.g., Work First; needs to support family; work schedule does not permit school);
- too late to re-enroll in school;
- family will not consent to teen's enrollment in school;
- language barriers; and
- school district administrative issues (e.g., GED program has no vacancies; due to past behavior issues, will not allow participant to enroll in GED prep courses until she turns eighteen; etc.).

#### ***B. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE: ENROLLED IN SCHOOL***

Report Mo/Yr	Number of TPP Participants	Number Missing Educational Status	Educational Status at Intake: Enrolled in School		Enrolled at Report Date		Not Enrolled at Report Date	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct01	1,349	35	659	50.2	414	65.2	221	34.8
Apr02	1,624	14	768	47.7	517	68.2	241	31.8
Oct02	1,708	24	805	47.8	537	67.5	258	32.5

- Nearly one-half of the program participants in each cohort (i.e., an average of 48.6%) were enrolled in school at the time of program entry.
- Roughly two-thirds (an average of 67.0%) of the participants who were enrolled at intake were still enrolled in school as of each of the report dates, with the overwhelming majority of them experiencing continuous enrollment (averaging 84.8%).

Report Mo/Yr	Educational Status at Intake: Enrolled in School	Enrolled at Report Date <sup>20</sup>	Enrollment was Continuous		Not Enrolled at Report Date	Not Enrolled because earned diploma or GED		Not Enrolled because of barriers beyond the client's control	
			N	%		N	%	N	%
Oct01	659	414	328	81.4	221	119	53.8	14	6.3
Apr02	768	517	439	85.2	241	106	44.0	19	7.9
Oct02	805	537	470	87.9	258	153	59.3	18	7.0

- Of those participants who were enrolled in school at program entry but not enrolled as of the subsequent reporting period(s), an average of 52.4% were not enrolled because they had earned their high school diploma or GED certificate.

### **C. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE: GED TRAINING**

Report Mo/Yr	Number of TPP Participants	Number Missing Educational Status	Educational Status at Intake: Enrolled in GED Training		Enrolled at Report Date		Not Enrolled at Report Date	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct01	1,349	35	28	2.1	20	71.4	8	28.6
Apr02	1,624	14	26	1.6	12	46.2	14	53.8
Oct02	1,708	24	34	2.0	21	61.8	13	38.2

- Only a small percentage of the participants in each of the cohorts were identified as being enrolled in GED training at the time of program entry, with an average of 59.8% of those still enrolled as of the report date(s).

Report Mo/Yr	Educational Status at Intake: Enrolled in GED Training	Enrolled at Report Date	Enrollment was Continuous		Not Enrolled at Report Date	Not Enrolled because earned diploma or GED		Not Enrolled because of barriers beyond the client's control	
			N	%		N	%	N	%
Oct01	28	20	17	85.0	8	1	12.5	1	12.5
Apr02	26	12	9	75.0	14	8	57.1	1	7.1
Oct02	34	21	17	81.0	13	4	30.8	5	38.5

- Meanwhile, depending on which cohort is examined, three-fourths or more of the individuals who were enrolled in GED training both at intake and at report date experienced continuous enrollment (i.e., an average of 85.0%).

<sup>20</sup> While the OCT01 cohort was missing information about continuity of enrollment for nine cases, the APR02 and OCT02 cohorts were each missing such information on two cases.

- The percentage of individuals who were not enrolled at the report date because they earned a GED varied considerably from 12.5% (Oct01) to 57.1% (Apr02) and averaged 33.5% across the three cohorts.

**D. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE: ENROLLED IN SCHOOL AND GED TRAINING**

Report Mo/Yr	Number of TPP Participants	Number Missing Educational Status	Educational Status at Intake: Enrolled in School & GED Training		Enrolled at Report Date		Not Enrolled at Report Date	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct01	1,349	35	21	1.6	13	65.0	7	35.0
Apr02	1,624	14	34	2.1	16	50.0	16	50.0
Oct02	1,708	24	40	2.3	24	60.0	16	40.0

- A small percentage of individuals in each cohort were reportedly enrolled in both school and GED training, ranging from 1.6% (Oct01) to 2.3% (Oct02) and averaging 2.0%.
- Of this dually enrolled group, an average of 68.3% was still enrolled as of the report date(s).

Report Mo/Yr	Educational Status at Intake: Enrolled in School & GED Training	Enrolled at Report Date <sup>21</sup>	Enrollment was Continuous		Not Enrolled at Report Date	Not Enrolled because earned diploma or GED		Not Enrolled because of barriers beyond the client's control	
		N	N	%	N	N	%	N	%
Oct01	21	13	12	92.3	7	5	71.4	3	37.5
Apr02	34	16	12	75.0	16	5	31.3	1	10.0
Oct02	40	24	16	66.7	16	6	37.5	1	11.1

- Of those enrolled at the report date(s), the percentage experiencing continuous enrollment ranged from 66.7% (Oct02) to 92.3% (Oct01) and averaged 78.0%.
- The percentage of individuals who were not enrolled at the report date because they earned either a diploma or a GED varied from 31.3% (Apr02) to 71.4% (Oct01) and averaged 46.7%.

<sup>21</sup> The OCT01 cohort was missing information about enrollment for one case, and the APR02 cohort was missing such information for two cases.

**E. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE OF THOSE EMPLOYED AT REPORT DATE**

Report Mo/Yr	Number in Program	Number Missing Job Status	Number Employed at Report Date		Not Enrolled in School		Enrolled in School <sup>22</sup> and/or GED Training		HS Graduate or GED Holder		HS Graduate or GED Holder and Attending College		Suspended or Expelled	
		N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct01	1,349	118	308	25.0	94	30.5	169	54.9	38	12.3	6	1.9	1	0.3
Apr02	1,624	67	376	24.1	111	29.5	188	50.0	68	18.1	8	2.1	1	0.3
Oct02	1,708	94	417	25.8	112	26.9	211	50.6	84	20.1	8	1.9	2	0.5

- For each cohort, approximately one-quarter of the individuals (i.e., an average of 25.0%) were employed as of the report date.
- For each cohort, less than one-third of the individuals employed (i.e., an average of 29.0%) were not enrolled in school.
- For each cohort, over 50.0% of those employed (i.e., an average of 53.8%) were also enrolled in school and/or GED Training or attending college.
- An average of 18.8% of those employed in each cohort were high school graduates or GED holders.

<sup>22</sup> This category includes enrollment in school, GED training, correspondence school and home school.

**SECTION III:**  
**SUPPORT SERVICES**

The teen parent provider agencies provide a number of additional support services to the program participants. These services were identified as being delivered in one of six ways: directly by the TPP agency, by sub-contract, by way of referral, or by some combination of the aforementioned.

In terms of **direct** service provision, the TPP agencies provide an average of 80.0% or more of the following services:

- Support Groups (with an average across the three reporting periods of 91.2% of support group services being provided directly by the agency).
- Emergency Services/24-Hour Crisis Intervention (averaging 84.4%).
- Transportation (averaging 85.5%).

Child Birth / Prenatal Classes															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	304	22.5%	117	38.5%	5	1.6%	138	45.4%	9	3.0%	35	11.5%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	383	23.6%	144	37.6%	10	2.6%	173	45.2%	11	2.9%	41	10.7%	4	1.0%
Oct-02	1,708	379	22.2%	133	35.1%	10	2.6%	187	49.3%	16	4.2%	33	8.7%	0	0.0%

Child Care															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	367	27.2%	39	10.6%	3	0.8%	304	82.8%	2	0.5%	19	5.2%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	472	29.1%	43	9.1%	10	2.1%	393	83.3%	4	0.8%	21	4.4%	1	0.2%
Oct-02	1,708	428	25.1%	40	9.3%	10	2.3%	364	85.0%	4	0.9%	10	2.3%	0	0.0%

Domestic Violence Services															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	145	10.7%	27	18.6%	0	0.0%	66	45.5%	48	33.1%	4	2.8%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	220	13.5%	44	20.0%	4	1.8%	114	51.8%	48	21.8%	10	4.5%	0	0.0%
Oct-02	1,708	219	12.8%	29	13.2%	4	1.8%	124	56.6%	44	20.1%	18	8.2%	0	0.0%

Emergency Services / 24-Hour Crisis Intervention															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	668	49.5%	573	85.8%	0	0.0%	76	11.4%	2	0.3%	17	2.5%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	837	51.5%	691	82.6%	1	0.1%	114	13.6%	0	0.0%	31	3.7%	0	0.0%
Oct-02	1,708	818	47.9%	694	84.8%	0	0.0%	85	10.4%	3	0.4%	36	4.4%	0	0.0%

Family Planning															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	845	62.6%	303	35.9%	3	0.4%	299	35.4%	23	2.7%	217	25.7%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	946	58.3%	409	43.2%	2	0.2%	388	41.0%	40	4.2%	107	11.3%	0	0.0%
Oct-02	1,708	936	54.8%	401	42.8%	1	0.1%	336	35.9%	43	4.6%	155	16.6%	0	0.0%

Food Bank															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	334	24.8%	193	57.8%	0	0.0%	116	34.7%	2	0.6%	23	6.9%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	449	27.6%	198	44.1%	3	0.7%	190	42.3%	15	3.3%	43	9.6%	0	0.0%
Oct-02	1,708	438	25.6%	187	42.7%	2	0.5%	215	49.1%	8	1.8%	26	5.9%	0	0.0%

Housing Search															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	500	37.1%	233	46.6%	1	0.2%	180	36.0%	32	6.4%	54	10.8%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	584	36.0%	281	48.1%	1	0.2%	207	35.4%	28	4.8%	67	11.5%	0	0.0%
Oct-02	1,708	616	36.1%	303	49.2%	0	0.0%	238	38.6%	17	2.8%	58	9.4%	0	0.0%

Legal Assistance															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	153	11.3%	18	11.8%	2	1.3%	118	77.1%	0	0.0%	15	9.8%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	197	12.1%	46	23.4%	0	0.0%	140	71.1%	0	0.0%	11	5.6%	0	0.0%
Oct-02	1,708	169	9.9%	37	21.9%	1	0.6%	119	70.4%	0	0.0%	12	7.1%	0	0.0%



Mental Health Counseling															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	312	23.1%	185	59.3%	2	0.6%	100	32.1%	1	0.3%	24	7.7%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	340	20.9%	190	55.9%	4	1.2%	126	37.1%	4	1.2%	16	4.7%	0	0.0%
Oct-02	1,708	354	20.7%	187	52.8%	4	1.1%	148	41.8%	2	0.6%	13	3.7%	0	0.0%

Nutrition Classes															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	488	36.2%	243	49.8%	4	0.8%	98	20.1%	32	6.6%	111	22.7%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	587	36.1%	302	51.4%	7	1.2%	92	15.7%	58	9.9%	128	21.8%	0	0.0%
Oct-02	1,708	552	32.3%	265	48.0%	7	1.3%	88	15.9%	67	12.1%	125	22.6%	0	0.0%

Parenting Classes															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	773	57.3%	548	70.9%	0	0.0%	78	10.1%	2	0.3%	145	18.8%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	979	60.3%	698	71.3%	9	0.9%	108	11.0%	3	0.3%	160	16.3%	1	0.1%
Oct-02	1,708	998	58.4%	653	65.4%	14	1.4%	164	16.4%	4	0.4%	163	16.3%	0	0.0%

Substance Abuse Services															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	158	11.7%	123	77.8%	1	0.6%	24	15.2%	2	1.3%	8	5.1%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	175	10.8%	109	62.3%	0	0.0%	36	20.6%	21	12.0%	8	4.6%	1	0.6%
Oct-02	1,708	168	9.8%	74	44.0%	14	8.3%	37	22.0%	32	19.0%	9	5.4%	2	1.2%

Support Groups															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	607	45.0%	566	93.2%	0	0.0%	24	4.0%	0	0.0%	17	2.8%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	834	51.4%	754	90.4%	3	0.4%	46	5.5%	11	1.3%	20	2.4%	0	0.0%
Oct-02	1,708	891	52.2%	801	89.9%	3	0.3%	72	8.1%	8	0.9%	6	0.7%	1	0.1%

Transitional Housing															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	77	5.7%	28	36.4%	1	1.3%	44	57.1%	0	0.0%	4	5.2%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	133	8.2%	48	36.1%	0	0.0%	71	53.4%	2	1.5%	12	9.0%	0	0.0%
Oct-02	1,708	159	9.3%	61	38.4%	1	0.6%	84	52.8%	1	0.6%	11	6.9%	1	0.6%

Transportation															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	927	68.7%	789	85.1%	1	0.1%	34	3.7%	0	0.0%	103	11.1%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	1,129	69.5%	962	85.2%	1	0.1%	50	4.4%	2	0.2%	115	10.2%	0	0.0%
Oct-02	1,708	1,127	66.0%	972	86.2%	2	0.2%	43	3.8%	0	0.0%	109	9.7%	1	0.1%

Teen Father Services															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	279	20.7%	126	45.2%	0	0.0%	89	31.9%	0	0.0%	64	22.9%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	435	26.8%	203	46.7%	0	0.0%	157	36.1%	7	1.6%	68	15.6%	0	0.0%
Oct-02	1,708	440	25.8%	199	45.2%	0	0.0%	140	31.8%	19	4.3%	81	18.4%	1	0.2%

Volunteers / Mentors															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	198	14.7%	91	46.0%	9	4.5%	73	36.9%	16	8.1%	8	4.0%	1	0.5%
Apr-02	1,624	260	16.0%	97	37.3%	56	21.5%	81	31.2%	17	6.5%	9	3.5%	0	0.0%
Oct-02	1,708	239	14.0%	127	53.1%	36	15.1%	55	23.0%	16	6.7%	5	2.1%	0	0.0%

Other Support Services															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Oct-01	1,349	489	36.2%	327	66.9%	1	0.2%	104	21.3%	0	0.0%	57	11.7%	0	0.0%
Apr-02	1,624	674	41.5%	408	60.5%	3	0.4%	152	22.6%	19	2.8%	71	10.5%	21	3.1%
Oct-02	1,708	729	42.7%	472	64.7%	2	0.3%	173	23.7%	8	1.1%	53	7.3%	22	3.0%

Other support services include the following:

1. Material Assistance: baby items (clothes, furniture, diapers, food, etc.), children's items (clothes, beds, etc.), household items (food, groceries, etc.), clothing/clothing bank, Christmas gifts, furniture/appliances, parenting articles/magazine subscriptions, utilities, shelter placement, phone card, emergency funds, bus tickets, pest control services and incentive store.
2. Medical Related: counseling (e.g., relationship, toddler, pregnancy, genetic, adoption, supportive, and grief), insurance, dental services, MI Child, public health nurse visits, WIC, MA referral, anger management, physical therapy, speech therapy, MIHAs, assistance with prescriptions, and assistance with medical services/insurance forms/medicine.
3. Education/Training Related: Early-On, Headstart, Evenstart, parenting education, life skills training, child development, Youth in Transition/MISTY, job readiness/skills (e.g., interview skills), Tuition Incentive Program (TIP), translator for hearing impaired, budgeting classes, and tutoring.
4. Community Resources/Groups: Children's Protective Services, Families First, SSI, MSU Extension, "Car Ministry", churches, community resources, Healthy Families, housing information, LaLeche League, Focus Hope, teen workshop, entrepreneurial program, Community Partners (through FIA), and Hispanic Outreach Services.
5. Other Services: liaison (with FIA, probation officer, etc.), adoptive services, bereavement services, document acquisition (i.e., birth certificate, driver's license, and state ID), information about emancipation, delinquency issues, and recreational activities

**SECTION IV:**  
**REASONS BEHIND CASE CLOSURES**

Reasons for case closure were obtained from a multiple response question in which up to three possible explanations could be cited. The results are shown below.

Reason for Closure	Oct01		Apr02		Oct02	
	425 cases closed		630 cases closed		694 cases closed	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Client quit	89	20.9	159	25.2	139	20.0
Inactivity on behalf of client	198	46.6	304	48.3	342	49.3
Client's goals and objectives were attained	82	19.3	111	17.6	110	15.9
Client no longer eligible due to age	20	4.7	63	10.0	46	6.6
Client moved out of service area	71	16.7	90	14.3	102	14.7
Other	85	20.0	87	13.8	153	22.0
Totals <sup>23</sup>	545	128.2	814	129.2	892	128.5

- The client's goals and objectives were attained in approximately one fifth of the cases closed (i.e., an average of 17.6% across the three reporting periods).
- Given that the Teen Parent Program is, for the most part, a voluntary program<sup>24</sup>, it is not surprising to learn that an average of 70.1% of the cases across the three reporting periods were closed either because the client quit or because of inactivity on behalf of the client.
- An average of 22.3% of the closed cases, across the three reporting periods, were closed either because of "aging out" of the program or moving out of the service area.
- The "other" response, which was selected in an average of 18.6% of the closed cases, included such reasons for closure as the following:
  1. Participant placed in juvenile facility, detention center, or incarcerated.
  2. Participant no longer parenting (e.g., gave custody of baby to relative; child placed in foster care; child up for adoption; baby passed away; miscarriage; male client found out he was not father of the baby).
  3. Participant's parent/family objects to program participation.
  4. Participant's work and school hours conflict with time available to see advocate (i.e., scheduling conflicts).
  5. Participant moved into transitional housing/teen living center and/or receives services through other programs.
  6. Unable to locate participant (e.g., participant moved and left no forwarding address; participant ran away; etc.).
  7. Participant received services for a number of years (e.g., four years).
  8. Participant chose not to work with new staff/case worker.

<sup>23</sup> Given that the data stem from a multiple response question, the total "N" exceeds the number of case closures, and the total percentages add up to over 100.0%.

<sup>24</sup> Minor Grantees living in counties that operate the Teen Parent Program are expected to participate therein.